TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS/Conference (Contraceptives-Abortifacients)

SUBJECT: Conference report to accompany the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999 . . . H.R. 4104. Lott motion to proceed.

ACTION: MOTION TO PROCEED AGREED TO, 58-39

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 4104, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999, will provide \$26.882 billion in new budget authority (BA) for the Department of the Treasury, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President, and various independent agencies. This amount is \$1.389 billion more than provided in fiscal year (FY) 1998.

Senator Lott moved to proceed to the conference report. A motion to proceed to a conference report is not a debatable motion. Senator Reid objected to the pro forma request to dispense with the reading of the conference report. Other Democratic Senators then joined in making repeated objections to further requests to dispense with the reading of the report. After the report was read, several Senators stated that they had required the conference report to be read to express their displeasure with the fact that a Senate amendment was dropped by conferees. That amendment would have mandated that Federal Employee Health Benefit (FEHB) plans provide contraceptives. It was controversial for two main reasons. First, its language was vague as to whether a health plan would be required to cover "all" forms of contraceptives. Initially, the amendment had stated that "all" must be covered; as the provision passed the Senate, the word "all" was stricken, which effectively would have left the decision up to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) as to the scope of the coverage that would have to be provided. OPM could have ordered plans to provide so-called contraceptives that primarily acted as abortifacients rather than contraceptives, such as the interuterine device (IUD). Second, the conscience-clause exemption applied only to religion-based plans, which would have been the first time that a Federal law was passed that said that only organized religions could have moral objections to a Federal policy. Many Members in both Houses had made clear that next year they would attempt to apply this mandate to every health plan in the country. Groups such as the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women of America, and National Right to Life could then have been required to provide health plans that

(See other side)

YEAS (58)			NAYS (39)			NOT VOTING (3)	
Republicans Democrats (54 or 98%) (4 or 10%)		Republicans	Democrats		Republicans	Democrats	
		(4 or 10%)	(1 or 2%)	(38 or 90%)		(0)	(3)
Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brownback Burns Campbell Chafee Coats Cochran Collins Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Domenici Enzi Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hagel Hatch	Helms Hutchinson Hutchison Inhofe Jeffords Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob Smith, Gordon Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Byrd Ford Graham Kohl	Snowe	Akaka Baucus Biden Bingaman Boxer Breaux Bryan Bumpers Cleland Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Durbin Feingold Feinstein Harkin Inouye Johnson	Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Reed Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Torricelli Wyden	EXPLANAT 1—Official F 2—Necessari 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired I	ly Absent nced Yea nced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 312 OCTOBER 9, 1998

paid for all contraceptive and abortifacient devices and drugs. Potentially, Catholic lay organizations and similar organizations with a moral basis but not directly connected to a religion's hierarchy could

also be forced to pay for contraceptive and abortifacient devices and drugs. Certain conferees strongly objected to any proposals to amend these two controversial parts of the Senate amendment. The amendment was then removed. After the Senate agreed to the motion to proceed, Senator Reid made clear that it was his intention to filibuster the conference report.

A motion to proceed to a conference report is not debatable.